

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,664
Docket NO.: 7635-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action objected to the title of the invention and stated that a new title clearly indicative of the invention is required. The Office Action also objected to claims 9, 15, 18 and 19 because of the informalities. The Office Action rejected claims 9, 10, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,714,268; hereafter Wang). The Office Action rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Itou et al. (U.S. 6,556,260; hereafter Itou). The Office Action further rejected claims 1-8, 11, 12, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wang. The Office Action stated that claims 13, 14 and 19 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate this indication of allowable subject matters. Applicants have amended the title and claims 9, 15 and 18 of the present invention to overcome the objections. Moreover, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 15 by introducing the allowable subject matters recited in claims 13 and 19 respectively. Furthermore, Applicants have amended paragraph [0030] to correct the typo. Applicants have further amended claims 1 and 5 to improve clarity. No new matter has been introduced into the application by the amendment made herein. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-8, 9-12, 14-18 and 20 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,664
Docket NO.: 7635-US-PA

According to the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected because of not descriptive. In response thereto, Applicants have amended the title as "PIXEL STRUCTURE OF DUAL MODE LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY". Furthermore, the claims 9, 15, 18 and 19 were objected to because of informalities. The Applicants have amended claims 9, 15 and 18 to overcome the objection.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 9, 10, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Wang et al. (U.S. 6,714,268; hereafter Wang). The Office Action rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Itou et al. (U.S. 6,556,260; hereafter Itou). The Office Action further rejected claims 11, 12, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wang. Moreover, the Office Action stated that claims 13, 14 and 19 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciate this indication of allowable subject matters. Applicants have amended claims 9 and 15 by introducing the allowable subject matters recited in claims 13 and 19 respectively. Hence, the amended claims 9 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Also, claims 10-12, 14, 16-18 and 20, which depend from claims 9 and 15 respectively, are also in condition for allowance, at least because of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,664
Docket NO.: 7635-US-PA

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wang.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 1 has been already distinguishable over the cited arts. As stated, claim 1 recites:

Claim 1. A dual mode liquid crystal display device, comprising:
an upper substrate;
a lower substrate comprising a first thin film transistor, a second thin film transistor, **a reflective electrode connected to the first thin film transistor, and a regional light-emitting source with a reflective cathode being electrically connected to the second thin film transistor ; and**
a liquid crystal layer between the upper substrate and the lower substrate.

(Emphasis Added) Applicants submit that the claim patently defines over the prior art of record, for at least the reason that the prior arts fail to disclose at least these elements emphasized above.

More specifically, as shown in Fig. 1 of the present invention, the electrode 108 used for electrically connecting to the thin film transistor 102 and the cathode 116 used for electrically connecting the light emitting diode to the thin film transistor 104 are made of reflective material which is not a transparent material. However, in the cited art, Wang emphasizes that the electrode 345 (shown in Fig. 4 of the cited reference) used for electrically connecting to the thin film transistor T3 and the anode 339 of the organic light emitting diode are made of Indium-tin-oxide which is a transparent material. Because of the transparent electrode/anode on the thin film transistor T3, it is necessary to have a reflective metal layer located between the buffer layer 325 and the glass substrate 321.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,664
Docket NO.: 7635-US-PA

Wang fails to teach or suggest that the transparent electrode 345 and the anode 339 can be replaced by the reflective metal electrode and the reflective metal layer 412 can be eliminated.

The Office Action asserted that "using a reflective electrode instead of combination of a reflective layer and an electrode is common and known". The Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. Notably, "Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, "[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." In re Laskowski, 871 F. 2d 115, 10 USPQ2d 1397 (Fed. Cir 1989). Further, "Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so." ACS Hospital Systems, Inc., v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577; 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Nevertheless, Wang fails to teach or suggest that the transparent electrode 345 and the transparent anode 339 electrically connected to the thin film transistors T3 and T2 respectively can be replaced by the reflective electrode and the reflective anode respectively. Wang fails to show the desire and the motivation for further modifying his pixel structure. Hence, there is no motivation for people skilled in the art to further modify Wang's application to obtain a pixel structure the same as what claimed in the present invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Wang fails to render claim 1

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/707,664
Docket NO.: 7635-US-PA

unpatentable. Claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Wang, at least because of their dependency from an allowable base claim. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-8, 9-12, 14-18 and 20 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *August 30, 2005*

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jciigroup.com.tw
Usa@jciigroup.com.tw